

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
NORTHERN DIVISION

IN RE: CERTIFICATION OF JUDGMENT
OF 060128/13-01 ARTICLE 7,
CONSTITUTIONAL COURT,
MACOMB COUNTY, MI

Case Number: 07-x-50173-BC
Honorable Thomas L. Ludington

/

**ORDER VACATING THE CERTIFICATION OF JUDGMENT, DENYING THE
REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION, AND DENYING THE MOTION FOR
ENLARGEMENT OF TIME AS MOOT**

This matter is before the Court on a response filed by claimant Daniel Williams to the Court's August 7, 2007 order to show cause. On February 27, 2007, the Clerk of Court accepted for filing a certification of judgment for registration in this Court. The judgment comes from the "Constitutional Court of the United States, Michigan state" and consists of hundreds of pages of "declaratory judgment in the form of findings of fact and conclusions of law" made by a jury. The judgment purports to find, among other things, that an individual violated certain federal statutes and the Constitution.

The legal basis for registering a certificate of judgment from another court in this Court is found at 28 U.S.C. § 1963. By its plain terms, the statute is limited to registering judgments from "any court of appeals, district court, bankruptcy court, or the Court of International Trade." *Ibid.*

On August 7, 2007, this Court issued an order to show cause ordering Joseph Merkel, acting as "Clerk of the United States Constitutional Court, Michigan state," to personally serve the parties to the judgment by August 31, 2007, and file a certificate of service by September 7, 2007. Additionally, the Court ordered the "parties to the judgment" to show cause in writing on or before

October 1, 2007 why the “judgment” registered in this matter should not be vacated. Only a single party, the plaintiff in the matter, Daniel Williams, filed any response to the order to show cause.

On September 26, 2007, Williams filed a request for clarification that the Court clarify its August 7, 2007 order. After review of the order, the Court believes that it is sufficiently clear. As a result, the Court will deny the request. Additionally, Williams filed a request for enlargement of time to file a response, which became moot when he filed a response soon thereafter.

On September 27, 2007, Williams submitted a “preliminary response” to the order to show cause. In his response, Williams posed the following query: “Does it really make a difference here whether the court is a ‘court’ within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1963?” Though Williams contends that legal justification independent from the meaning provided in § 1963 warrants this Courts certification of the judgment, his argument is without merit. The statute limits certification to judgments from any court of appeals, district court, bankruptcy court, or the Court of International trade. Williams offers no evidence or reasonable basis to show that the “United States Constitutional Court for the Eastern District of Michigan” is a “court” under the statute.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Daniel William’s request for clarification [dkt # 6] is **DENIED**.

It is further **ORDERED** that Daniel William’s request for enlargement of time [dkt # 7] is **DENIED AS MOOT**.

It is further **ORDERED** that the certification of judgment is **VACATED**.

s/Thomas L. Ludington
THOMAS L. LUDINGTON
United States District Judge

Dated: October 30, 2007

PROOF OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that a copy of the foregoing order was served upon each attorney or party of record herein by electronic means or first class U.S. mail on October 30, 2007.

s/Tracy A. Jacobs _____
TRACY A. JACOBS